

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

The title of the invention is allegedly not descriptive.

Claims 10 and 12 stand objected to because of informalities.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimoda (U.S. Patent No. 6,639,250) (hereinafter "Shimoda").

Claim 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamada (U.S. Application No. 2002/0190639) (hereinafter "Yamada").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 10 and 12 to improve the form of the claims. Claim 16 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-15 remain pending for consideration.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because the "interface" described in claims 8 and 9 is allegedly not currently shown in the drawing figures. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection for at least the following reasons. Applicant respectfully submits that this "interface" is shown in at least Fig. 13 and/or Fig. 18 of the drawings as originally filed. For example, the subject "interface" is the surface where the substrate 31 meets the transparent electrode 32 in Fig. 13. This "interface" is also seen as the surface where the

substrate meets the transparent electrode in Fig. 18, for example. In each of these drawing figures, this interface surface is illustrated as a horizontally-extending line where the substrate meets the transparent electrode. It is well understood that the term “interface” means “a surface forming a common boundary of two bodies, spaces, or phases.” This particular definition was obtained from the Merriam-Webster online dictionary at <http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/interface>. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is thus respectfully requested.

Objection the to Title

The Office Action alleges that the title of the invention is “not descriptive”. Accordingly, a new title is required. In accordance with this requirement, Applicant has changed the title to “ORGANIC ELECTROLUMINESCENT DISPLAY HAVING TWO REFLECTING PORTIONS FOR REDUCING INTENSITY REFLECTANCE OF THE EXTERNAL LIGHT BY AN OPTICAL INTERFERENCE EFFECT.” This title change generally incorporates the Examiner’s helpful suggestion at page 3 of the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the requirement for a new title is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 10 and 12 stand objected to because of alleged informalities. Applicant has amended claims 10 and 12 to improve their form in accordance with the Examiner’s helpful suggestion at page 4 of the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to these claims is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimoda.

Claim 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamada. Claim 16 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 is thus respectfully requested. The remaining rejections of claims 1-15 are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 describes an organic electroluminescent display including a combination of features including a specific recitation that “the optical film thickness of the light emitting layer, intensity reflectance R_1 at the front reflecting portion and intensity reflectance R_2 at the rear reflecting portion are configured so that an intensity reflectance of the external light viewed from the viewer is set to be 10% or less by an optical interference effect.”

Applicant respectfully submits that it is apparent that Shimoda fails to disclose, or even suggest, at least these particular features of independent claim 1 for at least the following reasons.

Shimoda discloses a technique to improve the reflectance ratio at a rear surface of the display panel. However, Shimoda provides no teaching or suggestion of how to reduce the reflectance ratio of the light that is incident to a front surface of the display panel. Applicant notes in this regard that Fig. 2 of Shimoda shows the rear portion of the display panel, and L is a thickness between the reflecting layers. Accordingly, the specifically-described features of the arrangement of the laminated optical structure of independent claim 14 are also neither shown nor suggested by Shimoda.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Shimoda does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 14. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claims 1 or 14, and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of all outstanding objections and rejection, and request the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this

application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573.

This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: November 23, 2005

By:



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

Customer No. 055694

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20005-1209

Tel.: (202) 842-8800

Fax: (202) 842-8465